

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 30. NO. 8

December 14, 1936

WHOLE NO. 805

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

REVIEWS

Gudeman, Aristoteles Poetik (*Edmiston*); Laistner, A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C. (*Hyde*); Grube, Plato's Thought (*Braunlich*); Barrow, A Selection of Latin Inscriptions (*Keyes*); Silk, Saeculi Noni Auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae Commentarius (*Abbott*); Allen, Halliday and Sikes, The Homeric Hymns (*Duckworth*); Chodaczek, De Prisciani Lydi Solutionum Capite vi (*Oldfather*); Robinson, The Germania of Tacitus (*Kerns*); Donnelly, Cicero's Milo, a Rhetorical Commentary (*Stinchcomb*)

RECENT PUBLICATIONS



Now Available . . .

TACITUS SELECTIONS FROM HIS WORKS

Edited, with Introduction and Notes

by FRANK BURR MARSH, PH.D. and HARRY J. LEON, PH.D.
Professor of Ancient History, Associate Professor of Classical Languages,
The University of Texas The University of Texas

The only edition which offers, in a single volume, the materials for a varied course in Tacitus, since it makes possible several different combinations from the *Annals*, *Agricola*, and *Germania*. The historical commentary is the work of a widely known *historian*.

546 pp., 5 x 7 1/4, includes maps and illustrations. List Price \$2.25

Send for an Examination Copy

Published by PRENTICE-HALL, Inc., 70 Fifth Avenue, NEW YORK

THE BUCOLICS OF VERGIL

Edited by FREDERIC J. DEVEAU, Groton School

THIS attractive edition has received well-deserved praise from teachers in both colleges and preparatory schools. Each of the Bucolics is prefaced by a short introduction; is printed in bold-face type; is followed by a series of notes, both grammatical and interpretative, and by a section on "Sources and Imitations", stressing the parallels in English literature. In addition to the general vocabulary, Mr. DeVeau has supplied a special vocabulary of words particularly associated with pastoral scenes.

Among those using the book are: Exeter, Hotchkiss, Choate, Princeton, University of Texas, Buffalo State Teachers College, and St. Joseph's College for Women. One teacher writes: "I know of nothing that is accessible which is quite so good for the purpose Mr. DeVeau had in mind. The notes are scholarly, and the selection of material excellent."

244 pp. Price \$1.25

For descriptive circular, please address

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 Fifth Avenue New York

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE ATLANTIC STATES

The Thirtieth Annual Meeting

WILL BE HELD AT

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, N. Y.

ON

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, APRIL 30-MAY 1, 1937

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published Mondays from October through May except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Columbus Day, Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). A volume contains approximately twenty-six issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication, Washington Square College, New York University. Distributed by Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York City. Printed by Lenz & Bleeker, Inc., New York City. Editor, Casper J. Kraemer, Jr.; Associate-Editor, Ernest L. Hettich; Advisory Board: George D. Hadzsits, Charles Knapp, David M. Robinson.

Address all business communications to John F. Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Germantown, Philadelphia; all other correspondence (including requests for back numbers) to the editor, New York University, 100 Washington Square East, New York, N. Y.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the United States; elsewhere, \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents, prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If "invoice" is required, 50 cents must be added to the subscription price; if affidavit to "invoice" is required, one dollar must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y. under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. 30, No. 8

DECEMBER 14, 1936

WHOLE NO. 805

REVIEWS

Aristoteles Poetik mit Einleitung, Text und Adnotatio critica, exegetischem Kommentar, kritischem Anhang und Indices Nominum, Rerum, Locorum. By Alfred Gudeman; pp. viii, 495. Berlin und Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1934.

It is now more than forty years since the publication of Professor Gudeman's edition of Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, which at once gave him rank among the leading classical scholars of our time. As a reviewer of that work wrote in the *New York Nation*, it was a possession for the ages. The same may be said without hesitation of this monumental edition of Aristotle's *Poetics*, and if it has not the same finality as the edition of the *Dialogus*, of which it was hard to see what more could be said after Gudeman had finished with it, this is only because both the matter and the text of Aristotle's treatise are so much more difficult, disputable and uncertain. The learned world might expect from any work by Professor Gudeman immense erudition and industry, together with the most finished scholarship, but could hardly expect in the treatment of a text like the *Poetics*, which has perhaps been more belabored by critics and commentators than any ancient classics of three times its length, the discoveries and contributions of lasting value which we find in this edition.

In his preface Professor Gudeman acknowledges his indebtedness to Mr. P. V. Bacon of Boston and to the American Council of Learned Societies whose generosity made possible the publication of this work. But this generosity being, in a financial sense, limited by the worldwide crisis, he was compelled to restrict his original design, and to omit his essays on the influence of the *Poetics* on literature and criticism since the Renaissance, and on the tradition of the text and the affiliations of the various MSS. But the latter has now been published in *Philologus* 90 (1935), Nos. 1, 2 and 4.

The long delay in the publication of his book

was, as the editor says in the preface, unexpectedly fortunate in that it enabled him to profit by new MS sources made available in I. Tkatsch's *Die Arabische Uebersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles und die Grundlage der Kritik des griechischen Textes*, in the preparation of which he had an important share.

The introduction which, for the reasons aforesaid, is much briefer than the editor had intended, falls under three headings: *Stilcharakter*, *Das Dispositionsschema der Poetik* and *Die Quellen der Poetik*. In the first he argues, I think conclusively, that this treatise was not and was never intended to be published, but was a 'Kollegienheft' or synopsis of lectures. It is true that Twining, whose merits among the early editors Professor Gudeman fully recognizes, had observed that the *Poetics*, in at least many parts, 'seems to have been intended for little more than a collection of hints or short memorial notes, and has sometimes almost the appearance of the *Syllabus* for lectures or a table of contents'. But, as our editor remarks, neither Twining nor any other scholar had noticed that this conclusion is rendered certain by 15.54b.19, for the passage would have no point if the *Poetics* had been or was intended to be published. Gudeman has also availed himself of this characteristic in the improvement of the text; for example, in 4.49a.15 all previous editors, following the *Parisinus* and other MSS, have read *καὶ τότε τῶν ὑποκριτῶν πλῆθος*. Here the last word could only be construed as an accusative of specification, and the conjunction seemed not to connect what followed with what went before. By changing *καὶ* to *κατά*, in the sense of 'with regard to', as in 1.47b.15, the phrase becomes a heading or 'Stichwort', and also becomes intelligible. For other cases see introduction p. 5, § 3.

In the second rubric of the introduction (6-8) Professor Gudeman shows that the *Poetics* falls into the class of *isagogic* treatises, in which the author states in the first part the general principles of the art or discipline with which he is

dealing, and in the second instructs the artist or practitioner how these principles are to be applied. E. Norden, in *Hermes* 40 (1905) 481-528, had proved that Horace's *Ars Poetica* is a composition of this kind. But Gudeman was the first to make this discovery in the *Poetics*, and as he says, the proofs are all the more striking because we have in this treatise only a fragment of a lecture-synopsis, not a finished artistic whole like the *Ars Poetica*. As he remarks, the *Poetics* begins with the assertion that the author's intention is to treat of poetry and its various elements and qualities; and he might have added that the second part, chapters 13-26, begins with a second advertisement to the reader that, 'after what we have already said, we must now consider what the poet *should* strive to attain and to avoid' etc. And this division is strikingly confirmed by the editor's demonstration that, although in chapters 1-13 the word *poiētēs* occurs 16 times, it is almost always as a mere indication of poetic activity or to signify a representative of a kind of poetry; and that, although in the first part phrases of obligation like *δεῖ* and *χρή* are rarely found, and only where no demand is made on the poet, in the second part the former is used 30 times and the latter twice in injunctions addressed to poets; and although these mandatory phrases are not employed in the grammatical chapters (19-22), the latter are obviously didactic rather than theoretical. He might have added that this *isagogic* character is also proved by the discrepancies between Aristotle's precepts and the actual practice of Greek tragic poets, as well as by his insistence on what is better or worse in the handling of the various elements of the plot. See especially chapters 14-17.

In the third section of the introduction, *Die Quellen der Poetik*, our editor, after indicating Aristotle's predecessors or authorities whom he mentions by name or refers to unmistakably, and passages in the *Poetics* from which pre-Aristotelian sources are necessarily inferred, attacks the prevalent opinion, upheld by such scholars as Vahlen, Wilamowitz, Bywater and Finsler, to name only a few, that Aristotle in his theory of poetry and fine art as set forth in the *Poetics*, plagiarized from Plato, as Finsler went so far as to say, or at least in all essentials closely followed his teaching. To me Gudeman's argument that the *Poetics* is from start to finish a protest against Plato's moral condemnation of poetry in the *Republic* (Introduction 21-28), is absolutely convincing, and it is significant that Professor Lascelles Abercrombie, writing in *An Outline of Modern Knowledge* (Gollancz, 1931), arrived independently at the same conclusion.

'Aristotle', he observes, 'never says that his theory is an answer to Plato; he never mentions Plato in the *Poetics*, and never even alludes to the Platonic objection to poetry. But his whole argument is exactly planned to invalidate Plato's argument at every point; and this falls in with his openly expressed opposition to Plato elsewhere' (879). Compare Gudeman's note on 1.47a.8. This is not to deny, as Gudeman admits, that Aristotle was greatly influenced by Plato; but this influence was only that which a great teacher is sure to have on a great pupil. It was indeed much like the influence of Hume on Kant, and resulted in opposition instead of agreement.

Any scholar who has a competent knowledge of the *Poetics* will be amazed at the improvements Professor Gudeman has been able to introduce into the text, which is one of the most difficult we have inherited from classical antiquity. Sometimes helped by Tkatsch's work, but often independently of it, he has corrected and annotated the text in a way that reveals the great scholar and critic. He proves that other MSS besides the *Parisinus*, to which up to now an excessive importance has been attributed, have an independent, and in some cases a decisive value. As examples I cite the readings in 1.47b.11; 3.48a.34; 5.49b.9; 7.51a.9; 8.51a.32; 13.53a.27 and 30; 16.54b.20; and finally as a crowning example, in 24.59b.13, where a trace of the brilliantly restored reading *ἐκτέρως* is found in an inferior MS (Riccardianus 46) in the form *τέτερως* by metathesis from *-τέρως*!

I have left myself only a little space for Gudeman's treatment of such fundamental questions as those connected with *mimēsis*, *katharsis*, etc. In the first paragraph of his commentary, on 1.47a.8, he rightly observes that *poiētikē* has in the *Poetics* the same sense as *poiēsis*, citing as other examples 4.48b.4 and 25.60b.15, but strangely overlooking the proof found only five lines below. But I am not sure that he is right in excluding entirely the more abstract sense 'über die Dichtkunst selbst'. The famous generalisation in 9.51b.5 shows that the abstract sense was in Aristotle's mind involved with the concrete, and that both *poiēsis* and *poiētikē* may convey the abstract meaning.

Since the significance of *mimēsis* is no longer disputed, Gudeman expresses a general agreement with Twining, and especially with Butcher, (3rd edition) 121-162. But when we came to *katharsis*, 6.49b.28, the difficulties and doubts are not easily disposed of. He admits of course that in the lack of the author's promised definition of this term, much remains obscure. But he proves, or at least makes probable, that this idea of purgation has nothing to do with the

katharsis of musical *enthousiasmos* in Politics 8.7.8.1341b.37 except in a loose analogical way, and nothing at all to do with *Phaedo* 69a-b, where *katharsis* means the entire removal of pleasures, fears and other emotions. On other points I must refer the reader to the commentary itself.

My own opinion is that an important passage for the meaning of *katharsis* is Rep. 3.411d. Here the usual sense of διακαθάρω 'purge' or 'purify', is not applicable. The context shows that the meaning, unrecognized by lexicographers and translators, of οὐδὲ διακαθαρουμένων τῶν αἰσθήσεων is 'since the perceptive facilities do not find scope for their activities', that is, 'are left unsatisfied'. This interpretation is quite in line with Aristotle's use of the word *katharsis* and indicates that, whatever his special definition may have been, the general sense of 'finding a scope' or 'outlet' was one of its recognized meanings.

The references to Aristotle's other works are very full, but in another edition or as a separate publication, a special treatise on the place of the *Poetics* in Aristotle's philosophical system would be desirable.

The proofreading by the editor himself and his friends Dr. Morel and Dr. Rehm, was exceptionally accurate. Outside of the few corrigenda on the last page, I have noted only two errors, 'C. G. Fiske' instead of 'G. C. Fiske' in the footnote on page 6, and '14.54b.10' instead of '14.54a.10' on page 244, sixth line of the last paragraph. The typography, paper, and all that concerns the external appearance of the book, sustain the high reputation of Messrs. Walter de Gruyter and Co.

HOMER EDMISTON

Milan, Italy

A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C. By M. L. W. Laistner; pp. xv, 492, 4 maps. London: Methuen, 1936. (History of the Greek and Roman World, Vol. II) 15s.

Apart from his excellent *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500-900* (1931), Professor Laistner is best known for his two textbooks, *A Survey of Ancient History* (1929), and *Greek History* (1932). The present volume treats only the 157 years from the close of the Persian Invasions to the death of Alexander. This is a unique period of world history, but one marked by great contrasts: by the culmination, under Athenian leadership, of ancient culture in literature, art and thought, and the almost universal use of the Attic dialect in literature; and, at the same time, by the political decay of the Greek city-states, and their incorporation first into Philip's nation-state of Macedonia, and finally

into Alexander's world empire. Thus the period is one of achievements on the grand scale and of failures—the latter usually glossed over by historians who still like to picture the Athenians of the Periclean Age as supermen. But, in the words of the author (xiii-xiv), the political story of Greece in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. makes 'sad reading'; its economic life, agriculture and industry were still undeveloped; the citizens of its leading city were largely the wards of the state; its standard of living was low, and cruelty was still the rule in the treatment of slaves and, above all, in war. It is to Professor Laistner's credit that he has placed equal emphasis on both the triumphs and the deficiencies of the age which he describes.

Part I, nearly three-fourths of the text (1-327), tells the political story of the Greek world of the period centering around Athens. It commands at once the interest of the reader not only by its intimate acquaintance with the sources both ancient and modern, but also by its clear and straightforward presentation. One example will suffice to show the author's scrupulous effort to be accurate—the use of the name Thuria (46 and n. 4) for the second colony sent out to Italy in 443 by Pericles to the older site of Thurii, even though Plutarch in his account of it fails to distinguish between the two.

One night, perhaps, at times cavil at the perspective of the book. Thus two chapters of 95 pages—over one-fifth of the text (71-165)—are devoted to the Peloponnesian War and its immediate consequences, while only one of 27 pages (291-317)—in itself a marvel of condensation—is given to the conquests of Alexander and their sequel. The author devotes a page each to the battles of Gaugamela (302-3) and the Hydaspes (312)—the latter Alexander's best planned battle—but only 9 lines to the siege of Tyre (290), one of the most notable in antiquity, one and one-half to that of Gaza (*ibid.*), and 27 to the final battle in the Great Harbor of Syracuse in 415 B.C., which include the retreat and capture of the Athenian army, and the punishment of the commanders and survivors (138-9)—certainly one of the most dramatic events in all history. Only 7 lines are given to the most famous royal race, that of Alexander in pursuit of Darius after Arbela (305). While 2 lines may be regarded as enough for the romance of Roxane (308), 11 are certainly too few even for a summary of the ancient greatness of Alexander (300).

Most of the historical judgments on events whose certainty is not attainable are eminently sane, as a few examples will make clear. Thus, the author shows (12) that the transference of the treasury from Delos to Athens in 454/3 B.C.

does not, as most historians maintain, mark the date of the conversion of the Delian League into the Athenian Empire, since that was a gradual process nearly completed by 461 B.C.; and he shows (131) the lack of evidence for another oft-repeated statement, that Athens forced her former allies to copy her constitution, at least before 440 B.C. when the Samian oligarchy was overthrown. He reduces the estimates of Xenophon and Diodorus of the number of troops in the army of Cyrus the Younger at Cunaxa to 25-30,000 (169), and doubts (172) whether history would have been materially changed had Cyrus been successful and replaced Artaxerxes on the throne. In discussing the King's Peace of 387/6 B.C., he combats (186) the usual notion that it represented only humiliation for the Greeks—the view expressed by Isocrates—for the Asiatic Greeks after their experience with both Athenian and Spartan rule may well have looked forward to peace and prosperity under Persia, while the mainland Greeks were just as certainly freed from a ruinous war and, besides, were free to enforce the terms as they saw fit. He interprets Eubulus' effort to enlist Peloponnesian help against Philip after the fall of Olynthus in 348 B.C. (244) not merely as a sop to public opinion at Athens, but as a genuine desire to arouse Greek feeling against a common enemy.

Professor Laistner disagrees (262, n. 1), with the recent contention of Wilcken that it was a stroke of genius on Philip's part to justify his Persian undertaking by appealing to Greek religion, i.e. by presenting it as a war of revenge for Xerxes' earlier destruction of Greek temples, and instead regards it only as a gesture, since there is no evidence that the Greeks were enthusiastic about the plan. Similarly, Alexander's destruction of Thebes in 335, while at the same time he spared Athens despite its previous agitation against him, is explained (294) as due not to any sentimental feeling for Athens, but rather to his need of the Athenian navy in his impending conquest of Asia. He differs (263) from Bury, Berve and Wilcken in attaching guilt to Olympias in the assassination of Philip, but follows (304 and n. 2) Tarn and Wilcken in regarding the burning of the palace at Persepolis in the late winter of 330 B.C. as an act of deliberate policy, thus symbolizing the end of Achaemenian rule, and not Berve, who sees in it merely an accident during a drunken carouse. He finds no reason (318) for assuming that Alexander in 323 B.C., had formed a plan to conquer the Western Mediterranean, since his supposed ambition to be a world conqueror comes from the late Alexander legend; but he does accept (300) the probability that after Issus in 333 B.C. Alexander conceived the

plan of conquering all Persia and not only its western part.

The reviewer would dissent from one of the author's judgments, where he doubts (138) whether the soothsayers in Nicias' army at Syracuse delayed the retreat because of 'superstitious folly' or because they were traitors to the Athenian cause. Since the same superstition caused Sparta to withhold help at Marathon, and a religious festival was alleged as her excuse for sending so small a contingent to Thermopylae, one is led to agree with Grote that such superstition was 'an attribute of the Greek character.'

The brief character estimates woven into the text here and there are excellent; e.g. of Epaminondas (219), a great military leader, but mediocre 'in constructive statesmanship'; of Philip (263-4), who 'has often had less than justice done to him', because of being overshadowed by his greater son and having the greatest of ancient orators as his relentless enemy; of Demosthenes (241-2), whose bribery at the hands of Harpalus is unproved, but who, even if guilty, accepted the money 'not for his personal gain, but for political ends' (327); of Alexander (318-20), whose achievement forms 'the most impressive failure in history', in that the continuance of his empire 'depended absolutely on one man—himself.'

One finds little to criticise in statements of fact. Professor Laistner might, however, be reminded that Asia Minor does not extend eastward to the Caspian (318), but only to an imaginary line drawn from Trapezus at the s.e. corner of the Black Sea to Issus at the n.e. corner of the Mediterranean. In his account of Issus (298-9) perhaps he will pardon one who has visited the battle-field for pointing out a slight misapprehension. He has Alexander, after leaving his sick and wounded at Issus, follow the coast-road south to Myriandus—the key to the Beilan Pass into Syria through which he later passed. On reaching here he learned that Darius had crossed the Amanus from N. Syria into the plain of Issus by a northern pass—Amanicae Pylae, the modern Bagtsché—and so was between him and his base, but still Alexander 'hastened back to Issus'. Despite the fact that the exact location of the town of Issus is unknown—except that Xenophon says it lay on the sea and was 10 parasangs (c. 35 miles) north of Myriandus it would have been impossible for Alexander to return there since Darius, after capturing it and slaying the wounded, barred the way with his huge army spread along the north bank of the Pinaros stream (Deli Tschai) from the sea to the foot-hills. Here in the plain south of the river the battle was joined—near Doert Jol on the branch

line of the Bagdad Railway completed in 1913 from Toprak Kaleh to Alexandretta, the latter on the site of Alexandria Issi founded near Myriandus by the conqueror after the battle. Thus Alexander retraced his course thus far through the Syrian Gates (Bab Junus), described long before by Xenophon (*Anabasis*, 1.4.4) as a narrow pass between the mountains and sea, and as exactly midway between Issus and Myriandus. While Professor Laistner does not mention this pass, he doubtless refers to it when he says Darius 'traversed the Amanus by one pass while Alexander crossed the range by another.'

The style of the book might have been enlivened here and there by the introduction of dramatic incidents. For example, the author might have given a picture of the huge difficulties overcome by Alexander in crossing the Hindu Kush mountains twice, in the early spring of 329 B.C. on his way north into Bactria (307), and in May of 327 B.C. on his way south into India (310), or his army's sufferings in crossing the desert of Gedrosia (the Mekran of Baluchistan) just before returning to Babylon to die. In the former case he crossed a pass—doubtless the Khawak—over 11,000 feet high, when his army was reduced to eating raw meat and herbs, a traverse far transcending in difficulty that of Hannibal over the Western Alps in late October of 218 B.C., so dramatically described by Livy; in the latter oppressive heat and the shortage of water and food caused terrific losses to his army, perhaps exceeding those of all his preceding campaigns.

Part II presents in seven chapters (328-469) the main phases of Greek life of the period treated—warfare, government, economic life, art, language and literature, science and philosophy, and religion. Into these chapters the author has crowded an enormous amount of well-organized information, which, however, sometimes makes them appear like catalogues. To summarize Greek art—architecture, sculpture, painting, vases, bronzes, coins, gems, and music—within the space of 20 pages (387-406) and make it readable without the use of illustrations is indeed a remarkable feat; or to tell the story of the Greek language and literature—dialects, education, lyric and dramatic poetry, history, geography and oratory,—in 28 pages (407-434) is equally astonishing. In the former is an excellent characterization of the great sculptors (393-401), even though the author might have given greater praise to Myron's 'well-known Discus Thrower', since it is the most famous of all athlete statues; and gone further than to say of Praxiteles that 'we can form a clear conception of his art' from his *Hermes*. For whether the latter be an original or copy as recently maintained (compare 399

n.1), it still remains the superlative statue of the ages. In the latter chapter there is an equally excellent characterization of the great dramatic poets of the time of Athens' glory (418-20) as well as of the great historians of the period (421-7). His contention that Herodotus was primarily interested in geography, archaeology and ethnology rather than in history is well founded, as also the author's refusal to follow Plutarch's diatribe against his veracity, for since the recent death of Professor Sayce, that estimate is dead. To say (448) that Socrates was 'the innocent victim of the democratic reaction at Athens before the Peloponnesian War' is certainly 'beyond dispute'. Only 9 pages are given to the final chapter on Greek Religion (461-9)—the state religion, festivals, mysteries, and foreign cults—a summary which forms a climax to the writer's powers of condensation. The emphasis on the idea of 'contract' between gods and man as the basis of Greek religion is rightly placed, and the reviewer, after having taught the subject for years, feels that he can fairly acquiesce with the statement that 'the inner life of the average Greek is to us a sealed book.'

One notes many Greek words throughout the text. Perhaps the author is more optimistic than the reviewer about present-day knowledge of Greek among even advanced students of Greek history. Even such transcriptions as *symmachy* (261), *symmories* (241), *synedrion* (261 thrice), *stasis* (323), *morai* (330), *strategi* (358), *isoteilia* (373), and many others are questionable, but words written in Greek characters—especially those not bracketed as explanatory—are more so.

There is a short appendix (470-3) of literary, epigraphic, numismatic and papyrologic source material, an excellent bibliography of modern works (474-9), and an index (481-92), the latter hardly adequate.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

University of Pennsylvania

Plato's Thought. By G. M. A. Grube; pp. xv, 320. London: Methuen and Co., 1935. 12s. 6d.

Against the background of earlier philosophy and of life in the Greece of Plato's day, Professor Grube traces through Plato's dialogues in chronological order¹ his accounts of his Theory of Ideas and of his views on Pleasure, Eros, The Nature of the Soul, The Gods, Art, Education,

¹ Accepting Ritter's chronology of the Dialogues in so far as it is determined by stylometry, Grube differs from him in regarding the *Protagoras* as later than the *Gorgias*, and the *Symposium* as later than the *Phaedo*.

and Statecraft. The convenient arrangement of the material makes Plato's *Thought* a useful book, while the fairness and acuteness of the author's judgments and the scrupulousness with which he avoids reading his own ideas into Plato render this work a valuable contribution to the understanding of Plato. There is much that is instructive, too, in Grube's incidental observations and especially in his allusions to modern thought and customs.

While the specialist will find the entire book useful, he will be particularly interested in Chapter I, *The Theory of Ideas*, with its four pithy Appendices. Grube holds that the doctrine of Ideas slowly developed out of the Socratic definition until it became the hypothesis on which, though Plato was well aware of its imperfections, he based his mature philosophy. Grube shows clearly that the Ideas are not concepts but the objective reality to which the concepts correspond. In agreement with Natorp and Wilamowitz (10, note 1), he finds the origin of Plato's technical use of *εἶδος* and *ἰδεῖ* in the ordinary employment of these words in the sense of 'what a thing looks like'. For example, 'from asking what all righteous things "look like" to asking "what it is they look like", thus supposing the existence of something beyond them which they resemble, is but a step, and it is a step which Plato definitely took between the *Euthyphro* and the *Meno* on the one hand and the *Phaedo* on the other'.

The remaining chapters will interest the general reader as much as the specialist. There is space here for brief mention of only a few of Grube's many clarifying interpretations.

In the refreshingly sane third chapter entitled *Eros*, the fact that for Plato love has a homosexual basis is explained in the light of the social conditions of ancient Greece and is not allowed to obscure the nobility of his highest type of love, 'the love of truth and beauty quickened by mutual affection'. Grube points out that love is important for Plato's metaphysics: providing the motive power which causes the souls of men to ascend to the Ideas, it is one of the means whereby Plato tries to bridge the gap between the noetic and the physical world.

'One of the most startlingly modern things in Platonic philosophy', according to Grube (133), is the discovery of the importance of conflict in the mind. Chapter IV, *The Nature of the Soul*, stresses this discovery and also the rediscovery of unity beneath diversity. In the carefully formulated psychological theory of the *Republic*, according to which emotion, represented as a stream which may be directed to different objects, can be used to vivify the intellect, the cold

intellectualism of the *Phaedo* is combined with 'the magnificent defense of the emotions which is the *Symposium*' (136). The divisions of the mind are made prominent once more in the *Timaeus*, where it is asserted that the intellect is all of man that is immortal. To Plato the intellect is somehow closely akin to the eternal Ideas.

Chapter V, *The Gods*, contains a penetrating analysis of the difference in meaning and connotation between the Greek word *theos* and the English word God. Grube succeeds in justifying his arresting statement that 'our modern conception of the divine is . . . more definitely anthropo-psychic than was that of the Greek'. His discussions of the relation of the gods to the Ideas and of Plato's stand on the question of free will are clear and convincing.

The manner of the book falls short of the level of its matter. While the style is usually vivid, it is marred by occasional colloquialisms and stilted expressions. The translations from Plato lack charm and are at times obscure. An extreme example is the following from the *Timaeus* (144):

And within this they built another part of the soul, which holds strange and compelling attributes within itself: first pleasure that greatest bait of evil, then pain escape from good, then rashness and fear, witless councillors, anger that is hard to pacify, hope that is easily misled. These they mix with unreasoning perception and desire that will grasp at everything. Thus of necessity they put together humankind.

And because of this, fearing to corrupt the divine where not quite inevitable, they house the mortal away from it in another part of the body.

Since Plato's speculations as to the nature of the physical world receive no separate treatment but are referred to in different places, the Indices might well have included more entries to guide the reader to these places. The book contains a number of misprints.

It is to be hoped that there will soon appear a second edition in which these defects of form shall be mended. In any case, Professor Grube is to be congratulated on having crowned his previously published articles on various aspects of Plato's philosophy with this large and clarifying study of Plato's *Thought*.

ALICE F. BRAUNLICH

Goucher College

A Selection of Latin Inscriptions. By R. H. Barrow; pp. viii, 91. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. \$1.75

This selection of 160 Latin inscriptions, with a clear photograph of one more as frontispiece, is designed 'to make available a few typical texts

for the use of students reading the history of the first two centuries of the Roman Empire.' The book is arranged by topics, of which the most important are: The Emperors and Events of their Principates, Senatorial and Equestrian Careers, Imperial Slaves and Freedmen, The Army and Navy, Municipal Life, Religion, and Private Life. Nearly all of the inscriptions included are taken from Dessau's collection; they are provided with brief notes, and sometimes with short introductory paragraphs. For the student's assistance there are also supplied lists of the Roman tribes and of the Emperors' tribunician years, and a table of abbreviations and numerals.

This well-chosen selection, though small, includes a number of the most important and interesting inscriptions of the period; for example, the Pisan decree on the death of C. Caesar, the complete Latin text of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, the greater part of Claudius' famous speech on the admission of Gauls to the Senate, and the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani*.

The editor has been careful to indicate restorations by square brackets, whenever a complete word or several words are lost; but when only part of a word is gone, and the lost letters can be filled in with reasonable certainty, he has omitted this indication. The volume is attractively printed and will be useful to beginners in Roman epigraphy as well as to students of the history and antiquities of the early Empire.

CLINTON W. KEYES

Columbia University

Saeculi Noni Auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae Commentarius. Edited by Edmund Taite Silk. pp. lxi, 349. American Academy in Rome: Rome, 1935.

The publication of early mediaeval commentaries is a laborious task full of many small perplexities, but for the light thrown upon mediaeval scholarship in its formative period of the utmost importance. We are greatly in Silk's debt for the first edition of this bulky text, which promises to be an essential contribution not only to our general knowledge of ninth century learning but to our information about the doctrine and activities of that remarkable man Johannes Scottus.

The work which Silk finds in three manuscripts of the twelfth century¹ he argues very plausibly

¹ They are (D) Digby 174 (misprinted Digy 274 in the facsimile) saec. XII, containing the commentary as far as v m.4.1; (P) Paris B.N. 15104 saec. XI-XII; containing parts of Books III and V; (γ) Laur. 78, 19 saec. XII containing portions of the commentary as marginalia to a text of the *Consolatio*.

to be of ninth century origin. The external evidence, although far from incontrovertible, creates a strong presumption in favor of this hypothesis. The *vita* occurs in this form in a tenth century manuscript, and there are traces of Insular influences on the text.² It is, however, from the internal evidence that the proof is largely drawn.

The commentator is an extraordinary person. An excellent Latinist, with some competence in Greek (xvi-xviii), he ranges over *omne scibile*, and in preface to III m.9 he explains the structure and plan of the world in an essay of seventeen pages (155.15-173) with two diagrams. Beyond a doubt he knows a great deal wrong³ and he cuts Boethius pretty closely to his own pattern, uncompromisingly reducing his author at times to the most intolerable banality⁴. Yet in his skillful treatment of the very genuine difficulties of Boethius and his firm grasp of the sometimes rather elusive arguments, he shows himself a man of keen intelligence and not inconsiderable intellectual power. Essentially a theologian, he is anxious that his students should not be misled into heresy⁵ and much of his exegesis is designed toward that end⁶.

² Silk's lists are drawn somewhat at haphazard, particularly as regards the spelling, an important part of his proof. Mere omission of *h* in a twelfth century manuscript is not even collateral proof, and *hanelo* is a not uncommon vulgar form. Letter confusions are strikingly few. Of the only two which he notes (xii), *voluntas* for *voluptas* need not be a letter confusion at all but error from general resemblance; I have noticed its occurrence in no other word. This can, however, be the result of the weakness of manuscript evidence for the text, and the lists of spellings known to be Irish could be extended almost indefinitely from the apparatus.

³ As in the notorious *Trimalchionism* (144.7) 'Alcibiadis' (not -es; the commentator takes this as a feminine ending) *quaedam mulier celebratissimae formae quam dicunt matrem Herculis fuisse.*' For amateurs of such *curiosa* I recommend 17, 16 ff. on the Academy and the Sirens and the account of the unsymmetrical mother love of the monkey 143, 4-9.

⁴ See Cons. I pr. 13 ..adstitisse mihi supra verticem visa est mulier.. and the commentator SUPRA VERTICEM ideo dicit, quia secundum philosophos omnis sapientia est in cerebro (12, 12-14).

⁵ Cf. 283, 1-5. Silk well compares (xv) the *Opuscula Sacra* commentary published by E. K. Rand (Johannes Scottus, in Traube's *Quellen u. Untersuch. zur lat. Phil. des Mittelalters* 1.2, Munich 1906).

⁶ That 'Considerable zeal is shown by the expositor in his efforts to provide his students with the right text of the *Consolatio*.' (Silk xiii) I do not find to be supported by the evidence. The elaborate argument supporting the wrong reading *angustam* for *augustam* in III. m.9.22 surely results from an uncertainty about the letter; nor is the passage *ratiōne perpetua* on page 174,5 an emendation.

That this picture fits only Johannes Scottus Silk argues at length and, I think, successfully. Presumably Johannes Scottus wrote a commentary—Peiper's *Vita III* is ascribed to him—this work closely resembles in general style and method both the *Opuscula Sacra* commentary and the known writings of Johannes Scottus; the theological inconsistencies, viewing all these together, are neither numerous nor striking enough to deny the authorship to Johannes; perhaps most important, the commentary of Remigius of Auxerre⁷ is shown (a little too ardently) to be derived from this work. No study of sources, style, vocabulary or syntax is made to reinforce these conclusions; of these the latter two should certainly have been added and an index provided; but, if the proof falls short of completeness, until more information is available it must be regarded as extremely probable that we have in this work the lectures of Johannes upon the text of the *Consolatio*.

The sections (xxvi-xxvi *ter* and liv-lvi) dealing with the classification of the manuscripts are the least satisfactory parts of the introduction. The evidence for the editor's sketch of the relations of the Johannes MSS to each other and to Remigius is, as he freely admits, meagre. For that reason, if we are to deduce even tentatively from these three passages that Remigius used a faulty text, that that text was of the P tradition, and that the P and D lines of descent are distinct, the trend of the evidence must be clear and unmistakeable. I do not find it so. To the interpretation of the passage at 195, 20-4 (xxvi) the objections are: (1) that it is theoretically unsound and confusing practically to attempt to show the interrelation of P and D by positing a relationship of the Remigius MSS; and further that it is absurd to attempt to establish the text of Remigius with reference only to the MSS of Johannes Scottus; (2) that the whole weight of this hypothesis rests upon the palpably false assumption that the error *-es* (acc.) for *-is* (gen.) in K could have come about *only* if the error *apertas* and not the correct *aperturas* preceded; (3) that Remigius was unintelligent or illiterate enough not to be able to choose between *aperturas illuminationis* (the correct and easier reading) and *apertas illuminationes* is not only essentially improbable but contrary to the evidence of his own text. To the conclusions drawn from the passage at 145, 6-10⁸. I protest that: (1) 'Quam interiora is certainly to be preferred to et non

⁷ See H. F. Stewart, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 17 (1916) 22-42, with excerpts of Remigius.

⁸ *Reprehenduntur homines quod malling cognoscere (ag- Remigius) bona corporum exteriora et non res quo loco melius reperiantur* (P. Remig. *quam interiora* D).

res' (xxvi) neither on stylistic nor transcriptional grounds. D's reading appears to be an emendation; (2) even if D were correct it would be much more probable that Remigius had influenced P than the reverse. The third passage (200, 17-201, 3), since the intrusive note in L and P cannot have belonged to the text of either Johannes or Remigius, and since Silk, if I may judge from the number of conjectures he offers himself⁹, feels it to be inconclusive, requires no discussion. The origin of this, as of the other additions in L, must wait for a thorough study of the text of Remigius.

There is, then, no ground for the belief that Remigius had a garbled text of Johannes, and that, in consequence, his commentary is not an indispensable adjunct to DP¹⁰. The position of γ is not clear; it is allowed a place of prime importance in default of discussion and its use in the text appears to be somewhat eclectic. That it is independent of DP, as Silk contends, is indubitable. Does it immediately follow this that it must descend in a direct line from the archetype? Why does it represent a better tradition than D Remigius, as Silk appears to believe at 11, 3-9?

As to the text itself, it suffers from one fault of method both in its constitution and in the reporting of the apparatus. Remigius, obviously an essential source for the text, especially in those long stretches which depend upon D alone, should have been quoted throughout at the foot of the page if not in the apparatus. In the quotations which do appear in Silk's apparatus, the citation is made from one MS, which is surely not satisfactory. Furthermore in two of the three passages mentioned on p. liv in which Remigius has the correct text, the correction occurs in the text as an emendation without reference to Remigius. If this is the case, are we to understand that at 8, 11 *inchoare* is emended from *indicara* (D) as the apparatus would lead us to suppose, or taken from Remigius (Silk 312)? Is *singultim* 8, 24 actually emended from *sigillatim* (D) or *singulatim* (Remigius; Silk

⁹ xxvi. Two are not clear. 'Someone (perhaps our commentator himself) copied into the margin of π two passages of Isidore . . .' Why should Johannes have in his hands a representative of the second MS generation, the putative founder of the P family? The suggestion that the marginalia were 'copied directly into B' I make nothing of. Does he mean L?

¹⁰ It seems clear that D and P represent the same line of tradition. Of Silk's examples on pp. liv-lvi the haplography at 208,11; dittography at 150,1; and the omission of *non* at 171,15 are sufficient marks of consanguinity. Nor does *mente concipiebat* D: *considerabat vel concipiebat* P (156,5) prove a crossing of MS lines. *Considerabat* is an intrusive gloss. Surely Silk does not believe that the position of a gloss is any indication of priority?

ibid.)? Does he supply *bonos in* at 246,13 from Remigius (Stewart, page 36) and correct *dispositio* (246,16) to *iudicium* from the same source? If these corrections are made from Remigius, I do not understand why he is not taken into account, to cite a few examples from my lists, at 18,16: *variis superstitionibus D: vanis Remigius* (Stewart, 27 ff.); the sentence at 18,18 without the period at *aegrotantis*; 28.2 *quia* (sc. Socrates) <a> *civitate co<m>pulsus est bibere aquam veniferam Silk: quia cicutam compulsus est bibere, herbam veniferam Remigius*; 28.6 autem *D: hic Remigius*; 28.17 *Nulla enim est haeresis quae non habeat aliquid virtutis D: veritatis Remigius*; 28.20 *septem partibus D: septem artibus Remigius*; 28.26 *Anaxagoras philosophus <fuit> qui . . . fugatus est Silk: Anaxagoras philosophus . . . fugatus est Remigius*; 30.29 *principum commotionem D: commotionem Remigius* (cf. 31,9); F<atum> et F<ortunam> *Silk: s.i.f. D: superbum illud fatum R*; and, to complete my point: 87.15 <haberent> *Silk: acciperent Remigius*.

It must be plain, then, that we cannot regard the text as established until we have the complete evidence from Remigius. It is to be hoped that Silk may now be able to give us that and a study of the sources, syntax, and style of the present work. With the materials to which he has limited himself he has done well. It may be that the tendency to correct toward classical norms of syntax is excessive, but that is a matter of opinion. Spellings are a matter of no consequence, but surely *ex<h>alentem*, <h>*ypot<h>eticae*, *gibosus* and the like are no kindness to the reader. Johannes would be more at ease in the MS spelling than in these borrowed elegances. They do not fit him.

Ohio State University KENNETH M. ABBOTT

The Homeric Hymns. Edited by T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes; second edition, pp. cxv, 471. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. \$8.75

Classical scholarship of the past thirty years, especially in the field of Greek religion and religious cults, has materially enriched our knowledge of the background of the Homeric Hymns. All students of Greek literature and particularly of the Hymns are therefore deeply indebted to Messrs. Allen and Halliday for revising the 1904 edition by Allen and Sikes. The editors not only summarize the work of other scholars but present the results of their own wide reading and fruitful research.

The last revision is found in the Introduction. The section on Prosody (lviii-lxiv) is new, and a few paragraphs have been added (lxxxi f.,

lxxxvii, xci-xci), but otherwise the changes are slight. The heading of VIII (incorrectly given as IX) is misleading, for the section deals only with earlier editions; the 1904 heading 'Editions, etc.' was therefore more accurate than the present, 'Bibliography'.

But the commentary proper and the introductions to the Hymns have been for the greater part rewritten. This is particularly true of the introductions to the longer Hymns; compare II, where in addition to a thorough revision of the original material new sections have been added on The Goddesses of Eleusis (114-118) and Origin of the Mysteries (123-126); III contains a new treatment of Apollo Delius and Apollo Pythius (194-200). In many instances the editors have departed from the views expressed in the first edition; e.g. instead of believing that the Hymn to Apollo 'is a compilation of *at least* two originally independent poems' (65, 1st ed.), they now state (191): 'It is therefore a modern misapprehension and a false exercise of historical fancy to deny that a Chian poet of the eighth century could embrace the two seats of Apolline worship in one hymn.'

In the commentary many notes of the first edition have been omitted or reshaped to make room for new material. It is perhaps indicative of the richness of the new edition that more than half of the items in the English index did not appear in the 1904 index. The editors are sometimes inconsistent in their use of abbreviations; an index of abbreviations would have enabled them to save space and would have avoided confusion; e.g. the letters B. and G. (349), instead of the usual Baumeister and Gemoll, might be troublesome to the non-specialist. The mere mention of Maass' name (101) is less helpful than in the first edition (3) where the exact reference is given.

It is perhaps unfortunate that economic considerations induced the editors to use the plates of the 1911 Oxford text. An edition of this scope should have a more complete apparatus, and the supplementary readings (93-96) and conjectures (444-447) are exceeding scanty. The latter section Allen entitles 'Coniecturae veri minus similes' and, as he says in his Preface, it is meant 'as a warning' to the reader. This reveals the same conservative attitude which he expressed in the 1911 preface (compare Ludwich's review in B. Ph. W. 32 [1912] 1563 ff.). It is often very helpful to have a number of conjectures on especially troublesome passages; e.g. V 252, where suggestions based on the reading of the MSS are omitted (see Agar, C. R. 30 [1916] 39). In general, the editors have shown but little inclination to consider or discuss the numerous

emendations which have been put forward in recent years. The Oxford text has not, however, been reprinted without change. Many of the readings criticized by Ludwich have been corrected: II 91, 122, 126, 274; IV 70, 346; V 44 (corrected also in II 195, 202, but not in V 134), 136, 153, 173, 202, 225. There are numerous other changes in text and apparatus; e.g. in the second Hymn, see 1, 144, 163, 179, 232, 253, 284, 411, 441, 484, 493.

The revised edition is far superior to that of 1904 and will doubtless long remain as the most complete work on the language, style, and interpretation of the Homeric Hymns.

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

Princeton University

De Prisciani Lydi Solutionum Capite VI. By

Alina Chodaczek; pp. 42. Lwów (Poland): Gubrynowicz, 1936. (Acta Seminarii Philologici II Universitatis Ioanneo-Casimiriana Leopoliensis. Fasc. I.) 5 Złoty

Priscianus of Lydia, one of the minor colleagues of Simplicius, composed a rather feeble treatise on meteorology and allied subjects, portions of which survive in an early Latin version under the title *Solutiones eorum de quibus dubitavit Chosroes Persarum Rex* (ed. I. Bywater. Suppl. Aristotelicum [Berlin 1886] I, 2). The material is mainly derived from Aristotle's *Meteorologica*, but in the 6th chapter, mention is made of Posidonius as a source, and a careful analysis indicates that a little something can be learned even from this late work for the reconstruction of that scholar's views on hydrology.

It had long been recognized that the work of Posidonius in this field had been used by Strabo (through Athenodorus), by Pliny (through Varro), by Seneca (through Asclepiodotus), and by Priscian (through Arrian, now generally agreed to be the one from Nicomedia, the most distinguished of the pupils of Epictetus), but not all the evidence which this last treatise could afford had hitherto been extracted. Miss Chodaczek, with thorough knowledge of the literature on the question, an admirable philological method, with acumen, and even with a welcome touch of vivacity in the handling of these not exactly dry, perhaps, but surely for the most part somewhat less than thrilling topics, has secured a few fairly important results, both positive and negative, for the reconstruction of Posidonius, that most important of all direct influences on Roman scientific and philosophic thought.

Thus the known doctrine of Posidonius that the earth was an island surrounded by one and the same sea (contrary to the view of Aristotle) is further attested and amplified (5ff.). It is then

shown (especially from a comparison of Pliny, Strabo, and Priscian) that Posidonius must have discriminated between the customary and the idiosyncratic movements of waters, i.e. the ordinary tidal ebbs and flows, and the peculiar behavior of small bodies like the Eubœan Euripus, the fountain of Arethusa, and the like (12ff.). Jacoby's conjecture that Posidonius had discussed a singular spring at Gades is shown to be correct (14). The order in which the various phenomena were discussed is then pointed out (16-17). Posidonius is shown to have been Pliny's source for the height of the tides in the British Isles (18ff.). The comparison of Pliny with Priscian shows Strabo to have reproduced his chief source with a little less than complete accuracy (21ff.); while the discussion of the tides had been concluded with some remarks upon the special characteristics of the sun and the moon (23ff.). Contrary to Aristotle, Posidonius believed that the stars were fed by the humors of earth, and that this supposed fact was a further argument in support of his doctrine of 'cosmic sympathy' (20f.). The theological coloring of Roman meteorology is then ascribed with all probability to Posidonius (27f.). He must have followed Aristotle closely on the question of the saltiness of the sea (28ff.), was the source of the story about bitumen floating on the Dead Sea (23ff.), and also discussed naphtha (in Priscian spelled νέφα, a form which, incidentally, has escaped all the lexicographers, including even Henry Stuart Jones) far more extensively than had hitherto been realized (35ff.). On the other hand much of the sensational material in later writers seems to derive not from Posidonius but rather from Varro (37f.). With a few other comments upon the arrangement of topics in Priscian's chief source, and the final conclusion that the work of Posidonius followed Aristotle so closely as to constitute essentially a kind of Stoic commentary upon his treatise, this closely argued and convincing little model of research concludes.

The University of Illinois W. A. OLDFATHER

The Germania of Tacitus; A Critical Edition.

By Rodney Potter Robinson; pp. xiv, 388, 1 plate. Middletown, Conn.: American Philological Association, 1935.

None but specialists in the textual history of the *Germania* (and these must be comparatively few in the English-speaking world) can hope to supplement in any way the material assembled by Professor Robinson in this large critical edition, and few will venture far in contesting his interpretation of this material except where matters of taste alone are concerned. All, on the other hand, must be grateful to him for the exhaustive

account of the manuscripts and the extensive critical apparatus which he provides. The detailed character of his work can be judged from the length of the introduction on the MS tradition of the *Germania*, which runs as far as page 268, and the three appendices (327-358) dealing with the textual history, Enoch of Ascoli and the Hersfeld codex, and the abbreviations and ligatures in the Hersfeld codex: these in turn are followed by a valuable bibliography running to page 379.

Professor Robinson's conclusions as to the filiation of the MSS are summed up in a stemma printed at the end of the book, a much more detailed stemma than the generally accepted one of Schönemann (diss., Halle, 1910) which, as Robinson tells us (350) 'deliberately ignores two-thirds of the manuscripts'. Schönemann, to be sure, was primarily concerned to establish the existence of three families of manuscripts, a view in which he seems to have been followed by Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* ii. 2, 291: 'Wir haben neben X and Y für die *Germania* ein drittes Apographon des Hersfeldensis Z anzusetzen'. Robinson's studies lead him to believe that there are but two such families, and that Schönemann's X and Z families must both be referred to a single fifteenth century apograph. Unfortunately the sigla used by Robinson differ so greatly from Schönemann's and, for example, from those used in Furneaux's edition in the O.C.T. (1899) that direct comparison of his work with that of his predecessors is not too simple a task.

After these exhaustive studies of the MSS, Robinson quite naturally bases his text on a much wider selection of material than previous editors have done: compare the somewhat supercilious language of Furneaux (op. cit., præf.) '... colligitur hos omnes sive ex deterioribus Y generis codicibus sive ex mixta quadam stirpe ortos et ad textum stabilendum parvi aestimandos esse'. His treatment of the material, however, is thoroughly conservative, and a text emerges which, if less sententious than we have grown accustomed to expect, is quite possibly more sound: the famous '*urgentibus (iam) imperii fatis*' (cap. 33), for instance, gives way to a distinctly pedestrian *in [gentibus repeated from previous line] imperii fatis* which however Robinson defends in thoroughly satisfactory fashion. The commentary which accompanies the text is of course primarily critical, although as is pointed out in the preface (ix) 'any consideration of a textual problem necessarily involves the interpretation of the passage in question'.

Quite apart from its independent value as a contribution to American classical scholarship, Robinson's *Germania* with its wealth of detailed

information will provide excellent material for those who wish to learn something of the technique of textual criticism and the problems of editorship.

J. ALEXANDER KERNS

New York University

Cicero's Milo, a Rhetorical Commentary.

By Francis P. Donnelly, S. J.; pp. viii, 247. New York: Bruce Publishing Company, 1935.

\$1.24

Unless the study of Cicero's orations can give pupils some skill in the fundamentals of effective speaking and some standards for the appreciation of rhetorical excellence, we might do better to abandon their study. Few teachers of Cicero attempt more than a perfunctory gesture in the direction of rhetoric, and yet there have been some recent evidences that its importance as a factor in school Latin is recognized. See, for instance, in CW papers by Roy J. Deferrari, *Some Phases of the General Report of the Classical Investigation* (19.75); Harry J. Leon, *The Technique of Emotional Appeal in Cicero's Speeches* (29.33-35); and Father Donnelly's own *Literary Study of the Classics* (9.170); and the fourth edition of Father Laurand's rhetorical study of the orations, *Etudes sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, Tome I, 1936.

Lack of familiarity with rhetorical details and technicalities deters many teachers who would like to stress this objective in their Cicero courses. In this unique edition of the *Milo* Father Donnelly has provided the best possible corrective for this weakness. A teacher who goes carefully through this little book will be ready to guide his pupils toward Ciceronian rhetoric.

Preoccupied with detailed rhetorical commentary and teaching devices, the editor has given so little attention to other factors that some unhappy errors undermine the reader's confidence in the editing. Umlauts, for instance, are wholly disregarded. Names as important as those of Ahala (8) and Petersson (224) are spelled wrongly. Only a modicum of historical setting is given, and some of it irrelevant. The text is asserted (vi) to be that of Teubner, but is actually closer to that of the Oxford edition. Although designed for use only in classes of teachers intimate with the Jesuit *ratio studiorum*, the book has two features which all teachers will gladly borrow: a collection of *Appreciations of Cicero* (207-236), and fifteen practical *General Exercises* (241-242).

JAMES STINCHCOMB

University of Pittsburgh

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Bibliography

Sattler, Paul und Götz von Selle—Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Schrift bis in das Jahr 1930; pp. xx, 234. Linz: Winkler, 1935. (Archiv. für Bibliographie, Beiheft 17) 15M.

Ancient Authors

Cicero. Pöschl, Viktor—Römischer Staat und griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero: Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Schrift *de re publica*; pp. 186. Berlin: Junker und Dönnhaupt, 1936. (Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abteilung Klassische Philologie, Band 5) 8.50M.

Herodotus—*Histoires. Livre II: Euterpe*, edited and translated by Ph. E. Legrand; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1936. 30fr.

Hesiod. Philipsson, Paula—Genealogie als mythische Form: Studien zur Theogonie des Hesiod; pp. 37. Oslo: A. W. Brøgger, 1936. (Symbolae Osloenses. Fasc. supplet. 7) 2.50Kr.

Lysias. Büchler, Otto—Die Unterscheidung der redenden Personen bei Lysias: Eine stilistische Untersuchung der Diegesis; pp. 69. Heidelberg: F. Bilabel, 1936. (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums und des Mittelalters. Reihe D, Heft 4) 5.60M.

Patres. The Desert Fathers, translated by Helen Waddell; pp. xi, 297. New York: Henry Holt, 1936. \$2.50

Highly readable translations of selections from the *Vita Patrum*. The pieces bring out the hitherto little known softer and more attractive side of early Christian asceticism.

Plato. Buchmann, Klara—Die Stellung des Menon in der Platonischen Philosophie; pp. 102. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. (Philologus, Supplementband xxix, Heft 3) 7.50M.

A discussion of the Meno as marking the transition from the earlier to the later stages in the development of Plato's thought.

Plotinus—Schriften. Band III, Die Schriften 30-38 der chronologischen Reihenfolge, übersetzt von Richard Harder; pp. 196. Leipzig: Meiner, 1936. 9.50M.

Propertius. Reitzenstein, Erich—Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz; pp. 110. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. (Philologus, Supplementband xxix, Heft 2) 6M.

A psychological treatment of Propertius and the elegy with special attention to theories of Jachmann and Knoch.

Philology. Grammar. Metrics

Marouzeau, J.—Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin; pp. xix, 329. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1935. (Collection d'études latines, série scientifique, xii) 40fr.

A study of Latin style covering sound, diction, syntax, phrasing, rhythm, etc. The introduction contains interesting remarks about style in general and its relation to grammar. Competent and comprehensive.

History. Social Studies

Barenton, Hilaire de—L'origine des langues des religions et des peuples. Part 2, vol. II, Les langues, leur dérivation du sumérien. Les religions, leur origine dans le sacrifice. Les peuples, ils se différencient par leurs rites; pp. 798. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1936. 80fr.

Schneider, Nikolaus—Die Zeitbestimmungen der Wirtschaftsurkunden von Ur III; pp. 119. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico 1936 (Analecta Orientalia, 13) 65L.

Strzygowski, Josef—Spuren indogermanischen Glaubens in der bildenden Kunst; pp. xx, 496, ill. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1936. 33M.

Vittinghoff, Friedrich—Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit: Untersuchungen zur 'damnatio memoriae'; pp. 117. Berlin: Junker und Dönnhaupt, 1936. (Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abteilung Alte Geschichte, Band 2) 5.20M.

Art. Archaeology

Brunner, Hellmut—Die Anlagen der ägyptischen Felsgräber bis zum Mittleren Reich; pp. 89, 1 pl., ill. Hamburg: Augustin, 1936. (Ägyptologische Forschungen. Heft 3) 12M.

Buschor, Ernst—Die Plastik der Griechen; pp. 123. Berlin: Rembrandt, 1936. 6.50M.

100 excellent plates which, with the accompanying brief text constitute a survey of the leading features of Greek sculpture from 1000 B.C. down through the fourth century A.D.

Lamb, Winifred—Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos; pp. 226, ill., pls. Cambridge University Press (New York: Macmillan), 1936. \$18.50

Exhaustive publication of an important Bronze Age site. Fourteen chapters describe the objects found and offer the groundwork for an absolute chronology. Three appendices on special topics. Profusely illustrated with cuts and plates.

Epigraphy. Paleography. Numismatics

Geist, Hieronymus—Pompeianische Wandinschriften: 400 Originale Texte mit Übersetzungen; pp. 105. Munich: Heimeran, 1936. 3.70M.

Kase, Edmund Harris Jr. (ed.)—Papyri in the Princeton University Collections Vol. II; pp. xi, 130, 10 pls. Princeton University Press, 1936. \$3.00

Publication of ninety-two documents from the Princeton collection dealing chiefly with the Roman and Byzantine periods.

Philosophy. Religion. Science

Morton, Henry Canova Vollam—In the Steps of St. Paul; pp. 510, ill., maps. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1936. \$2.50

Riddle, Donald Wayne—Early Christian Life, as reflected in its literature; pp. 265. Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1936. \$2.50

Scott, William—A History of the Early Christian Church; pp. 375. Nashville, Cokesbury, 1936. \$2.50

Textbooks

Fraser, Russell E. and William D. Pearson—Visualized Units in Ancient and Medieval History; rev. ed., pp. 314. New York: College Entrance Book Co., 1936.

A relatively full outline for secondary schools; contains good lists of readings and suggestive tests.

Miscellaneous

Meissinger, Karl August—Divine Adventurer, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul; pp. 385. New York: The Viking Press, 1936. \$2.50

The story of this novel is laid in the 6th century B.C. and deals with the adventures of a merchant, one Sira, who induced Cyrus to restore the Babylonian captives and in whose person the author reconstructs the life of a so-called 'Second Isaiah'.